



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,884	07/25/2003	Hans-Joerg Buchring	WWELL73.004AUS	3837
20995 7590 02/22/2008 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER GAMETT, DANIEL C				
ART UNIT 1647		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/22/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/627,884

Applicant(s)

BUEHRING ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL C. GAMETT

Art Unit

1647

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10 and 18-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10 and 18-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/03/2008 has been entered.
2. Claim 1-5, 7-10, and 18-35 are under consideration.
3. All prior objection/rejections not specifically maintained in this office action are hereby withdrawn.
4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. In the Advisory Action mailed 11/13/2007, Applicant's were notified that the introduction of the limitation of binding to the same epitope as that bound by the recited monoclonal antibodies raised an issue of new matter. The introduction of claim changes which involve narrowing the claims by introducing elements or limitations which are not supported by the as-filed disclosure is a violation of the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir.1996). The genus of antibodies that bind to the same epitope as an antibody produced by the recited hybridoma lines is smaller than the genus of antibodies that bind to the same antigen,

which had been recited previously. The question of whether the smaller genus is contemplated in the instant specification as filed arises because neither the term "epitope" nor its equivalent "antigenic determinant" is used in the specification. In remarks filed on 01/03/2008, Applicant argues that the language of the amended claims is implicit in the teaching of the specification. The examiner notes that the instant specification discloses the following: "According to an object of the invention, the antibodies according to the invention also now make it possible to prepare further antibodies which bind to the same antigen. Using the antibodies according to the invention, it is possible to employ well known methods to isolate the corresponding antigen structures and to develop further monoclonal antibodies against the same antigen structures, with the known methods being employed in this case as well" ([0035] of the published application). The term "corresponding antigen structures" is reasonably interpreted as indicating an antigenic determinant or epitope. Therefore, "develop further monoclonal antibodies against the same antigen structures" is reasonably construed as developing antibodies that bind to the same epitope. With this understanding, Applicant's argument is considered persuasive and the recitation of "epitope" will not be rejected as new matter.

New Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claims 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for antibody fragments selected from the group consisting of Fab, F(ab)2, and Fv, does not reasonably provide enablement for fragments consisting of a single CDR, wherein the fragment retains antigen-binding specificity. The specification does not enable any

person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

7. The courts have interpreted the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 to mean that the specification must enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention without undue experimentation. The courts have further interpreted undue experimentation as requiring “ingenuity beyond that to be expected of one of ordinary skill in the art” (Fields v. Conover, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1971)) or requiring an extended period of experimentation in the absence of sufficient direction or guidance (In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977)). Additionally, the courts have determined that “... where a statement is, on its face, contrary to generally accepted scientific principles”, a rejection for failure to teach how to make and/or use is proper (In re Marzocchi, 169 USPQ 367 (CCPA 1971)).

8. It is well established in the art that the formation of an intact antigen-binding site generally requires the association of the complete heavy and light chain variable regions of a given antibody, each of which consists of three CDRs which provide the majority of the contact residues for the binding of the antibody to its target epitope. The amino acid sequences and conformations of each of the heavy and light chain CDRs are critical in maintaining the antigen binding specificity and affinity which is characteristic of the parent immunoglobulin. It is expected that all of the heavy and light chain CDRs in their proper order and in the context of framework sequences which maintain their required conformation, are required in order to produce a protein having antigen-binding function and that proper association of heavy and light chain variable regions is required in order to form functional antigen binding sites. Even minor changes in the amino acid sequences of the heavy and light variable regions, particularly in the

CDRs, may dramatically affect antigen-binding function as evidenced by Rudikoff et al (Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1982 Vol 79 page 1979). Rudikoff et al. teach that the alteration of a single amino acid in the CDR of a phosphocholine-binding myeloma protein resulted in the loss of antigen-binding function. The fact that not just one CDR is essential for antigen binding or maintaining the conformation of the antigen binding site, is underscored by Casset *et al.* (2003) *BBRC* 307, 198-205, which constructed a peptide mimetic of an anti-CD4 monoclonal antibody binding site by rational design and the peptide was designed with 27 residues formed by residues from 5 CDRs (see entire document). Casset et al. also states that although CDR H3 is at the center of most if not all antigen interactions, clearly other CDRs play an important role in the recognition process (page 199, left col.) and this is demonstrated in this work by using all CDRs except L2 and additionally using a framework residue located just before the H3 (see page 202, left col.). Therefore, a claim to an antibody fragment consisting of a single CDR, wherein the fragment retains antigen-binding specificity is, on its face, contrary to generally accepted scientific principles, and a rejection for failure to teach how to make and/or use is proper.

Conclusion

9. Claims 28-35 are rejected.
10. Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 18-27 are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel C. Gamett, PhD., whose telephone number is (571)272-1853. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath N. Rao can be reached on 571 272 0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1647

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DCG

Art Unit 1647

26 February 2008

/David S Romeo/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647